

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XL

JULY 22, 1942

No. 950

The Church's Social Mission

MOST REV. FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN, D.D.

*Address of the Archbishop of New York at the Fordham University
Commencement, Wednesday, June 10, 1942.*

FROM the very purpose of its being, the Catholic Church has not only a religious mission but also a social one. The Church's work is the sanctification and the salvation of the souls of men, and men cannot be separated from their social environment. By reason of her Divine commission to care for the souls of men, the Church has both a primary interest and authority in the social and economic spheres. Pius XI, of holy memory, clearly enunciated this truth when he declared:

It is not the office of the Church to lead men to transient and perishable happiness only, but to that which is eternal. Indeed "the Church believes that it would be wrong for her to interfere without just cause in such earthly concerns;" but she never can relinquish her God-given task of interposing her authority, not indeed in technical matters, for which she has neither the equipment nor the mission, but in all those that have a bearing on moral conduct. For the deposit of truth entrusted to Us by God, and Our weighty office of interpreting the entire moral law, demand that both social and economic questions, in so far as they refer to moral issues be within the competence of the Church's concern.—*Quadragesimo Anno*.

It is, however, as a loving and wise mother rather

than as a stern authority that the Church wills to exercise her sacred ministry. She would use, she must use, this teaching authority because it comes to her as a most sacred trust. Yet in its use, from the first, the Church has had regard to and a reverence for the authority and duty of the civil authorities to whom, under the aspects of temporal welfare, these same spheres of social and economic welfare belong. From the beginning, as may be clearly seen in the teaching of Saint Paul, the Catholic Church has conceived the human race as constituting either in fact or in possibility one mystical body, a unity both moral and spiritual, of which Christ is by Divine right the Head, and His Spirit, the vivifying soul.

Because the Church considers all men as members of one mystical body—of one great human family—she can never approve doctrines, either social or economic, that run counter to the welfare of all the people for the special advantage of one particular class or for the disadvantage of another. Her attitude is always that of a just and impartial mother who desires for all, especially for the weak and underprivileged, a reasonable share in those gifts with which a most loving Creator has enriched this earth.

MOTHER OF ALL

The Church desires to be the Mother of all mankind without distinction. All men are, at least potentially, and in hope, her sons, and she will never and can never favor any social or economic group to the prejudice of others. As the Mother of all, she loves and cherishes all. But a mother has the right and indeed the duty, to care with especial tenderness and attention to the weaker and needier of her children.

That is why, during the last century, an uncontrolled Liberalism brought about an exaggerated form of Individualism. That is why the saintly and learned

Leo XIII vindicated fearlessly and clearly the rights of the laboring classes in the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. This Encyclical Letter was an impulse that had a most important and salutary result in effecting improvements in the living and working conditions of laboring men, in furthering the ideals of social justice, in securing a living wage for workers, in asserting and maintaining the right of laboring men to organize, and in having a more equitable share in the fruits of their labors.

Yet while defending those classes that are in the very nature of the case less able to defend themselves, Mother Church has never and will never sanction a complete reversal of conditions that would make of the laboring classes in their turn either the confiscators of property, or the sole beneficiaries of their labors, and deny to owners of property a likewise reasonable share in the fruits of industry and the management thereof. One evil does not justify another. Humanity is not to be bettered by the substitution of one injustice for another, or by a new form of oppression replacing a former galling yoke of enslavement whether it be economic, social or political.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PEACE

Above the shifting, contrary theories of social philosophy and the contradictory voices of would-be social and economic prophets and dictators, the calm, quiet voice of Christ's Vicar sounds, a beacon of truth and of reason, pointing the way to economic and social peace. Always this beacon has channeled confusion with the rational middle course of justice and peace. Pronouncements of the Holy Father explain God's Laws as the natural and reasonable foundation for social life in its primary unit of the family. They are also in complete accord with the fundamental charters of our American duties and freedoms.

They vindicate the right of private ownership of property but in the just manner of which the civil State is the immediate arbiter. For the right of an individual to possess property does not contravene the right of the State to place limits and conditions for the possession of that property for the common good.

The right to own property is maintained by the Church, yet not without emphasizing the concomitant obligation devolving on owners to use the fruits of possession in the spirit of faith, of justice and of charity, for the welfare of their fellow man. The Church recognizes the superior claim of the common good of all. She proclaims and teaches the sacredness of stewardship which possession imposes.

The dignity of the individual is of primary importance in the Church's social program. She contradicts as false the tenets of the totalitarian philosophy which denies and would destroy the dignity of the individual, making almost every detail of his life, his acts, and his expressions a matter of government regulation and domination. She condemns the concept of the deification of the State or of any individual or groups of individuals who vaunt their blood, their race, their nation, their unbridled prowess. Likewise does the Church deny the premises and predict disastrous consequences in the predominance of an internationalism which preaches universal brotherhood and promotes by class warfare, world-wide revolution, ruthless destruction of human life and family life.

UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

And what is the concept of universal brotherhood preached by Jesus Christ? It is a brotherhood inspired by a common faith in the Fatherhood of God, the potential universality of man's redemption, and the ceaseless mission of the Spirit of God striving to

unite all classes of peoples in the bonds of a true fraternity of a common Faith, Hope, Charity.

The Church has not failed in its mission to men but men and nations have failed to follow God. Men and nations have rebelled against God and have cried out in the words of Lucifer transformed into Satan: "We will not serve."

Nations have unjustly and cruelly sought to extend their boundaries by recourse to arms in the most widespread, devastating war in history, which, if it be not Armageddon, is certainly its prelude. The Catholic Church has no sword save the Sword of the Spirit. Her mission is promoted by no other weapons save those her Divine Founder left to her: the might of Truth and the disarming power of Charity. These are her entire armament. Adapting herself successfully, yet without compromise in truth or in morals, to those varied forms of civil government that nations use, she carries on as best she can her tireless and Divine vocation, a Teacher of Faith, Hope and Charity, a Shepherd of immortal souls, a Mother of families and nations.

PERSONAL AND MORAL REFORM

The Catholic Church, as a Voice crying in the wilderness of modern paganism, has not ceased to enunciate as the first requisite for real progress in the remaking of society the necessity of personal and moral reform. Without moral standards and faithful, prayerful adherence to those standards, men considered either as individuals or as members of political or national groups are but building their own life structures on their national structures, on sand and on quicksand.

With sadness and with truth, Pope Pius XI gave to the sick and dying world the healing and saving prescription of the Divine Physician, and with his

words from the Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, I shall conclude:

There can be no other remedy than a frank and sincere return to the teaching of the Gospel. Men must observe anew the precepts of Him Who alone has the words of eternal life, words which, even though heaven and earth be changed, shall not pass away.

All those versed in social matters demand a rationalization of economic life which will introduce sound and true order. This is the perfect order which the Church preaches with intense earnestness, and which right reason demands; which places God as the first and supreme end of all created activity, and regards all created goods as mere instruments under God, to be used only in so far as they help towards the attainment of our supreme end—Peace on earth to men of good will and the eternal salvation of souls.

Pius XII and Peace Aims

LUIGI STURZO

Reprinted from NEW EUROPE, May, 1942.

THERE is much talk about the new order and peace aims. In a matter of collective character (political and economic as well as social) much comes from the free initiative of the individual, but an important part belongs to the interdependence of events and the inner logic of history.

From this viewpoint, those are right who say that the peace will be like the war was, for we must not believe that peace will descend from heaven in a perfect shape, thus leaving nothing to men but to accept it. As in the war on either side, the influence of specific interests, passions, ideals, both true and false, is felt, so, in the construction of peace, the same passions shall affect the will—free but not always independent of those who shall establish the terms of the new order, or disorder, however it will be.

Therefore, Pius XII was certainly right to bring forth, at Christmas 1939, his famous five points

(which he reaffirmed in his Christmas address of 1941), inducing the belligerents to think of them as a basis of study, preparation and orientation for peace and, at the same time, of course, for the war itself. His intervention, certainly the most authoritative in the world, has the same ethical motives as any honest man, inspired by sound ideals and by Christian sentiments toward a national morality, who would make similar peace suggestions. That is the reason why the Pope rightly makes a direct appeal to the public opinion of all peoples in order that they might induce their governments to base the new order on the principles of the moral law: all wise, honest men who desire common welfare and peace shall cooperate to create the warm atmosphere that favors the growth and the development of a new order which will be better than the past.

It is interesting to note what Pius XII said on the occasion of his address last December, reproducing his exact words:

Such a new order, which all peoples desire to see brought into being after the trials and the ruins of this war, must be founded on that immovable and unshakable rock, the moral law which the Creator Himself has manifested by means of the natural order and which He has engraved with indelible characters in the hearts of men: that moral law whose observance must be inculcated and fostered by the public opinion of all nations and of all states with such a unanimity of voice and energy that no one may dare to call into doubt or weaken its binding force.

It is evident that such public opinion (which Pius wants to be unanimous) must be formed during the war so that, as the time of the peace conference, the conviction will prevail that the moral law must be restored, for peace cannot have a more solid base.

APPLICATION OF THE MORAL LAW

There are many obstacles to the formation of such public opinion. Let us speak of the free and demo-

cratic states. There, opposition will come from three parts, either concealed and indirect, or open and aggressive: from those who, by conviction, do not believe in moral laws (positivism has infested our schools for half a century); from those who make a profit out of every war; and from nationalists, blind with passion.

The first group, though they do not believe in moral law equally valid for everybody, do admit, in one way or another, certain principles which coincide with justice, liberty, or a moral order. They may be incoherent with respect to their own principles, but, nevertheless, we may say that fortunate incoherence brings them close to the common ideal of humanity, dragging them away from totalitarian theories based on a disintegrative and selfish concept of morality.

The second group is the cancer of every society; one must know them, denounce them, banish them, like one does with robbers and plunderers and smugglers. Let us watch out for them on an international plane. But how clever do they camouflage! It is the Laval-type I speak of, not the man.

Finally, the third group, the nationalists, should feel warned by the Atlantic Charter and the Washington declaration. Though it is true that the meaning of a signed document lies only in its execution, the men who direct world policies have certainly the power to suppress any sort of rising nationalism in the name of principles that were made public and have obtained common consent.

It is not easy to form a general and clear public opinion regarding the application of the moral law on an international scale. There will be necessary many detailed discussions and elaborate plans, much propaganda in order to meet actual interests of the various strata of the social organism: for example, do we all agree that the bombing of civilian populations, without military objectives, has to be discarded? Indeed,

it cannot have any other aim than that of spreading terrorism. Even in democratic countries there is a large section who maintain that we must meet the enemy on his own ground. Public opinion is hardly prepared to withstand a similar temptation, confounding technical or strategic issues with what is merely an outlet of passion, or coolly calculating brutality. The moral law has to be established above the spirit of vengeance and other cruel instincts.

The consequences of such an attitude will be only fully appreciated after the war, when the foundations for the new order will be laid. This, however, will not be possible without a pacification of the spirits. If the democratic countries and their allies, after a victory, will come with hands that are not stained by the terrorism which the Axis uses in its occupied countries, understanding with the defeated nations will be easier or less difficult once their responsible leaders and direct executives are eliminated. This will be a psychological factor of eminent importance for the future of the world.

It is always clever to be moral, even in politics; it is a mistake not to believe that chicanery and terror, sooner or later, will not lead to their due punishment. This, however, will not come by itself as long as public opinion does not become interested in moral problems and in the practical issues that determine war-policies and the preparation of peace. We may, therefore, take for granted that the thought of the Pope and our own coincide to a full extent, that the basis of the new order ought to be the moral law and that the most efficient (and, let us add, the most democratic) means to this purpose consists in enlisting the interest of the public opinion as widely and as vividly as possible.

THE POPE'S PEACE POINTS

The five points of Pius XII are generally known.

They lead us directly into the heart of the problems that will stir the post-war world. The first question that arises is the following: "Do they (the five points) have anything to do with the war itself and its immediate objectives? If they have (as they actually do), in what ways can they affect the course and the direction of the allied warfare?"

Let us make a brief analysis of them, taking the text of 1941 as a basis.

In the first place, the Pope demands that, in the new order, the great states respect "the rights of the smaller states to political freedom and economic development." This, indeed, is the trial by which the great democratic powers will be distinguished from the totalitarian. The first are obliged by their very definition to respect such rights. That was expressed by the Atlantic Charter (August 14, 1941), as well as by the declaration of Washington (January 1, 1942), when first Great Britain and the United States, and then the other allies, pledged themselves not to seek territorial or other advantages. Thus, the present war is already defined by the democratic part: no imperialistic war to establish the predominance of one power over another, no war for annexations or to smash the weak and the small.

Are there any shadows on this side? Yes, and they ought to be eliminated.

First, there is the Indian question. The London declaration of last September, according to which the Atlantic Charter would not be applied to India, might be a strictly legal reservation, but certainly was inspired neither by political nor by moral wisdom. Here it must be stated in favor of England that her enlightened government has been able to bring welfare and order to India with a minimum of compulsion and a maximum of possible advantages. But England has not been able to direct the inherent forces in India toward a system of autonomies which today is recog-

nized as necessary and even urgent both for the present war and the future peace. Unfortunately, hurried provisions made in the last moments usually do not turn out satisfactorily nor are they effective in the long run. The problem of India is so intimately connected with the new situation in Asia that its solution cannot be postponed. The failure of Sir Stafford Cripps' mission has been a shock for all. We hope that Britons and Indians will very soon reach a satisfactory solution.

The other dark zone is Russia. Stalin authorized signing the Atlantic Charter and the declaration of Washington, which are based upon the idea of freedom, including freedom of religion. In spite of some contrary affirmations, there is no religious freedom in Russia. Sir Stafford Cripps has clearly stated that Moscow does not desire any change in the present status, feeling no necessity for it. Nevertheless, we would confide in the future and use all the goodwill and cooperation of the allies in order that general freedom, and religious freedom in particular, do not only appear in the Soviet constitution, but are applied in reality, while the practical barriers preventing their realization will be eliminated.

Another shadow that needs to be cleared is the problem of the Baltic countries: Finland, now at war on the German side, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, now occupied by the Germans, are small states with whom Russia had friendship and peace treaties based on the recognition of their national existence. The guarantees that Russia has a right to demand for the Balticum must not violate the personality and the rights mentioned by the Pope in his first point.

Fortunately, Poland has concluded an agreement with Russia and, strange as it is to imagine, Polish troops are now fighting beside the traditional enemy.

With regard to the countries now at war, which in case of an Allied victory would be defeated, it is

necessary to make a distinction between the governments and the peoples because peoples and their representatives will replace the parties and men of totalitarianism. Therefore, we cannot approve when men like Churchill and Eden (the latter in a broadcast of January 5, 1942) declare that "what matters in foreign affairs is not the form of internal government of any nation . . . the trouble with Hitler, for instance, was not that he was a Nazi at home . . ." This old story, repeated also with regard to Mussolini, Franco and Petain, leads back to the very sources of our present tragic situation. Much wiser, and on far safer ground, did the authors of the new lend-lease settlement proceed at Washington on February 24 for post-war economic improvements. They stated that the settlement should be "open to participation by all other countries of like mind." Very good! For if there is no "like mind" there can be no whole-hearted international cooperation.

THE NEW ORDER AND THE PEACE POINTS

It will take a long time before a certain similarity of feelings and hopes will be reached between the peoples who will emerge from the chaos of the war. But who believes that a new order can be established within two or three months, rising out of the conference like Minerva from the head of Zeus? At least three stages will be necessary: (1) that of armistice, demobilization and, for many countries, provisional governments; (2) that of the restoration of the right that, before the war, belonged historically to the victors, their allies and their colonies; (3) that of the return to internal freedom on the part of the defeated countries, and the establishment of their legitimate governments who shall participate at the conference in order to define their specific rights and obligations and to agree on the final scheme of international organization.

Today, is there anybody in the world who believes that the Axis is willing to accept the *first point* of the demands of the Pope? When free countries have been turned into slaves like Czecho-Slovakia and Austria by Hitler, Albania and Abyssinia by Mussolini, Manchuria and Nanking-China by the Japanese (just to speak of what happened before the war), nobody has a right to believe that Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo made total war with the idea, afterwards, to sit down around a conference desk and give back freedom and political independence to the countries that they occupied with their armies.

Can one say, then, that the Pope, by proposing the first point, has spoken in favor of an Allied victory? This would certainly be to go too far. Pius XII addresses everybody from a moral and spiritual platform like a preacher in church who reminds his audience of the Ten Commandments. Among his listeners there may be some who repent for their sins while others do not. Everything may happen in this world, even that Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo repent for their deeds. But at least, so far, there is no sign that would justify us to believe in such repentance. The Pope knows it very well, but can he foresee the future? His duty is to affirm moral values in international relations before all, including the Axis countries.

Second point: to respect the culture, language, tradition of the minorities. In this, Italy must be blamed for her attitude in the past as much as Poland and any other country that has violated the elementary rights of its minorities. The Pope's advice is good for General Franco for his treatment of the Basques and the Catalans; but especially for Hitler for his persecutions of the Jews, and at the same time for his vassals in Rome and Vichy, Budapest, Bucharest and Bratislava.

If this has been going on in the past, and is still

going on during the war, who thinks that a victorious Axis would not even do worse in the future?

As to Christianity in general and Catholicism in particular, we know perfectly well the ideas of Hitler and the other Nazi leaders who are leading Germany and Europe toward a new order. However, if there is anybody who prefers present experience to any lesson of the past, and if he is not being convinced by the war news, he should read *Gott und Volk—Soldatisches Bekenntnis* (God and the People—A Profession of a Soldier's Faith). In those pages he will not only find the anti-Christian spirit of Nazism, but also many passages that refer to the religious and international attitude of a victorious Nazi Germany. Let me quote just three of them:

We live in an epoch of decision. With a recognition of the values of race and blood there has begun a new conception of all life. It manifests itself outwardly in the formation of a new style, a new will of life. The epoch of the international humanitarian dream is drawing to an end, and with it the dream of Christian humanity which for two thousand years has agitated men without approaching even one step toward its goal.

Race and people are raised to sacred ideas. They form an aspect of our time and the law of the future. What serves this law is good and must continue to exist. What is not recognized by this law is bad and must be changed, better it must disappear.

Each epoch has its sign. Two epochs, two signs are facing each other today; namely, the Cross and the Sword. The sword is a weapon of fight. The cross is dragged by people who are resigned. In the Sign of the Cross Christianity is drawn up today, not Christianity.

When we announce faith in an eternal Germany, we close an epoch of religious strife. Who of us, in fact, will not declare himself for this faith? He would be a criminal and a traitor and has no place among us. When we raise up before Germans their country and their people, it can no longer be said with relation to religious duties, "Give to Caesar that which is Caesar's and to the Church that which is the Church's." Then we will know but one commandment—Everything for Germany.

These are the aims of the Nazis in the present war, aims that are shared by the military caste in Japan and the Fascists in Italy. How could one think that, after the total war in which they have engaged them-

selves, they will overnight become humanitarians and internationalists, Christians, so that they will accept such principles as the rights of the future minorities and execute them within the new order, or at least respect them? Is there any space left for minorities in the totalitarian states, and in victorious totalitarian states?

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The *third point* leads us to the economic problems of the post-war world. The Pope demands that all countries shall have a share in the resources of the earth, putting an end to the monopolies that were created "by coolly calculating egoism." He adds, however, an interesting passage, which, in our opinion, has not been stressed sufficiently by the press: "In this regard," he says, "it is for us a source of great consolation to see admitted the necessity of a participation of all in the natural riches of the earth, even on the part of those nations which in the fulfilment of this principle belong to the category of givers and not of receivers." There seems to be an evident allusion to the Atlantic Charter which was communicated to the Pope by Myron Taylor. It says: "Fourth, they will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligations to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms, to the trade and to raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

The theory of liberal economy had its serious faults, while the system of national monopolies has been a ruinous one; we have to find the golden mean between the two; namely, a share in proportion to the needs of each country and international cooperation. The agreement on lend-lease settlement constitutes a good practical basis for post-war economy; it gives proof of the fact that general statements and points for the

future are more than mere *flatus vocis*. The Inter-American conference at Rio de Janeiro has a great promise from an economic point of view.

Though there can be no *a priori* made post-war economy, certain starting points may now be established: the abolition of prohibitory tariffs, the elimination of privileges of class and capital, the reopening of trade outlets, the facilitation of exchanges, and, if the gold should remain on one side, it will be necessary to put it back into circulation in order to avoid a division of the world into those who die the death of King Midas and those who shall die the death of poor Lazarus, "longing to be filled with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table" (as Saint Luke describes it).

On the other hand, the economic outlook presented by a victorious Axis would be the serfdom or slavery of the subdued nations, forced to work for the ruling nations. Such slavery is already being practised in countries like Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, and, naturally, in the rest of the occupied countries. The German has the skilfulness of preparing in advance schemes and projects, even to the smallest details, the gift of a technical imagination as to what should be done within five or ten years; just the opposite to the Englishman who accomplished (or not) what can be done today or tomorrow, leaving the rest to events and chance, to his own ability or to Providence.

An economic plan established for all subdued countries, or still to be conquered, so that all become tributary to Germany, with only Germany possessing the keys for the production and distribution of the riches is the idea. This is not a political system, a system of custom duties or an industrial monopoly (things that have been known in the past), but an effective economic machinery in which no wheel can move unless Germany turns the switch, determining its rhythm and its speed. This is what awaits us in the future if

Germany is able to establish the new order. So far, we have seen what Nazi organization means in the field of labor where it is based on labor-trustees (the representatives of the party government) who, according to the leadership principle, decide on the systematization of the workers. Long before the war, they were organized in a military system under the impressive name of Labor Front. The war has transformed labor in the totalitarian countries into a form of serfdom. The enlistment of hands abroad in order to cover the demand for workers within has all the characteristic features of a regimentation of slaves.

The idea of slavery has won so much ground under the totalitarian regime, in any field of human activities, that it has almost lost its frightening aspect in the economic field. The military domination of the conquered countries, conceived as a rule over slaves, is exactly the opposite of the practice of England and France who sought to keep colonial discipline with a minimum of military units, granting little by little to the dominions political equality and economic independence.

It is obvious that, in a future new order established by the Axis, it will be impossible to apply the Pope's third point when economic slavery will be integrated with political slavery.

RESTRICTION OF ARMAMENTS

What is to be said of *points four and five* of the Pope's appeal? They deal with the restriction of armaments, an international organization responsible for the maintenance and possible modifications of international treaties.

The Axis probably desires the restriction of armaments, but in an unilateral way: all weapons to the Axis powers, complete disarmament for the defeated and subdued peoples. One must not believe that Ber-

lin-Tokyo-Rome would make the "mistake" of Versailles, leaving open a possibility for the vanquished of concealed or even open rearmament; nor is it possible to think that they will promise gradual disarmament as provided in Article VIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations. By no means. Their victory would mean a victory of force, not of right; of power, not of morality.

On the other hand, the Allied Powers are being tempted by the idea of some sort of unilateral disarmament. One ought to be careful to avoid mistakes from the beginning. The demobilization of the defeated countries and the surrender of their weapons in the period of armistice is a military necessity beyond discussion. But, in the peace treaties, one ought to establish, without hesitation, the periods within which the gradual transference of the rights of the victors to the federation or leagues will have to be achieved, who shall then represent the collective interests of the peoples, not the particular interests of an individual state or a small group of states. This is the only way to come to an effective collective restriction of armaments if there will be true international federations and a true league of nations, endowed with the necessary powers.

This is not the place to discuss what will be the new international organization. The Pope demands guarantees in order that the treaties be observed and, also, that they may be revised in time to avoid the rise of new conflicts. There will have to be juridical, political and military bodies functioning on an international scale. At present, we are still in the dark: neither the Atlantic Charter nor the Declaration of Washington cast a sufficient light on these questions. Pius XII does not go into details as Benedict XV did in the Letter of Exhortation of August 1, 1917.

It is here that public opinion must take its stand so that the politicians, statesmen, economists and

scholars of the various countries now allied for the war bring forth, not merely general ideas, but thoroughly elaborated plans to which international attention should then be called, stimulating expert discussions as well as enlisting the common interest. This should be done now, during the war, in time, so that one will not have to do a hurried job in the last minute, improvising something that would be neither useful nor mature. We must be aware of the fact that, at the end of the war, the peoples will be weary, mistrustful, impatient; there will be a host of problems to solve, which, in many instances it will be impossible to solve. The world will be disorganized, suffering, and impoverished, and passions will overcome reason.

Pius XII has raised his voice since December 1939, saying to everybody that the peace will be as we prepare it and as public opinion will enforce it. His appeal to the moral law, to the values of Christianity and to the benefits of religion is, at the same time, an appeal for freedom against those who are building up a system of slavery, an appeal in favor of the order of law against those who think of an order (or disorder) based only on force.

Japanese State Idolatry

Reprinted from THE TABLET (London)

IN THE spring of 1940 the Japanese Government recognized four religions: Buddhism, "Sectarian Shinto," Christianity and (a trifle later) Islam. They declared at the same time that "State Shinto" was not a religion; by this, however, they in fact meant that it was above other religions. "State Shinto" priests are Government officials; priests of the four "recognized religions" come under the Department

of Education. The value of the latter, in fact, is regarded as educative and useful as an instrument of policy, while "State Shinto" is the serious state cult.

To understand the development of "State Shinto" it is necessary to delve into the very remote past. The word Shinto means the Way of the Gods, and it is used to define the primitive cult evolved by the Japanese in the dark ages of indeterminate length before they came seriously into contact with the civilization of China (which happened, approximately, sixth century A.D.). When the Japanese adapted Chinese ideograms to their own language, they recorded the ancient chronicles of their race in two books: the *Kojiki* and the *Nihongi*. They consist of legends concerning the origin of the Japanese islands and the Japanese people, and of legendary tales of the early Emperors.

These collections are not without a certain charm, and they recall vividly the myths of Greece. Briefly the "Sun Goddess" (*Amaterasu no O-Mikami*) is regarded as the divine ancestress-in-chief of the imperial house, while the very islands themselves are considered to have been brought forth by a species of parturition peculiar to divinities; Japan itself, therefore, is spoken of very literally as the Land of the Gods. These two collections of legends are the sacred writings of the Shinto cult, the chief aims of which are the veneration of the imperial ancestors, of their living representative and of the islands of Japan. On to this, however, is grafted a variety of rites of different origin: animism, fertility rites and rites connected with the lustral properties of water.

Roughly speaking, Shinto is the worship of the race and land of Japan (the living symbol of which is the Emperor) and of the gods and spirits to which the imagination of the people and the delight they take in the beauties of their land gave birth. It boasts no code of morals, no complex system of ethics (such, it considers, are for lesser breeds without the law),

and in practice it consists of picturesque ceremonies (the original significance of which, as in the ritual dances known as Bugaku, is largely forgotten); it stresses only extreme veneration for the Emperor—"The Way of the Emperor"—the imperial ancestors, and, by extension, for the Japanese race and its destiny.

Its shrines are to be found in every village (almost in every road) and the "cult objects" may be of the most diverse nature. Those shrines connected with the tumuli of Emperors (such as the Meiji Mausoleum outside Kyoto), or with the cult of dead Emperors of particular merit (such as the Meiji Shrine in Tokyo), and above all, the shrines connected with the divine ancestress (such as the Ise Shrines) are, of course, treated with extreme reverence. There is even an official hierarchy of shrines according to their official merit. No Government action of importance is undertaken without the dispatch of a messenger to inform the divinities at the Ise Shrines. Shinto is therefore the birthright of every Japanese; it is the religion (if it is worthy of that term) of the Japanese race. It is a tribal cult of an extremely primitive type.

With the adoption of Chinese manners and culture in the sixth century A.D. came Buddhism, which had recently been introduced from India through Central Asia into China, and which was then enjoying a great vogue under the T'ang Emperors. The immense advantage of Buddhism over Shinto is obvious; its complicated system of metaphysics and its doctrines of universal implication bowled over the Japanese, and soon usurped the position occupied by Shinto. Shinto ceremonies continued, however, and the Emperor (though he nearly always abdicated and retired to a retreat as a Buddhist monk) was always an object of veneration. Buddhism encroached upon Shinto, and indeed certain Shinto divinities (such as Hachiman—often thought of as the God of War) were given Bud-

dhist rank, and enrolled as Bodhisattvas. Many popular spirits of rivers and mountains were also incorporated into the Buddhist pantheon, or changed into Buddhist personalities.

Buddhism was brought over to Japan by a variety of sects, differing from one another in a similar manner to the Protestant sects. These sects were filled with considerable vitality (though not sufficiently so to cause them to persecute one another, except in comparatively rare instances), but this was gradually drained out of them by two factors: the Japanese tendency to grasp and then to elaborate the form, rather than the content, and the thought-destroying policy of the Tokugawa Shogunate (seventeenth to nineteenth centuries). The former tendency is apparent in every Japanese activity, and, though it is often exaggerated, it must always be borne in mind.

The policy of the Tokugawa Shogunate was largely conditioned by the contact with the West, and in particular with Christian missionaries, which was thought to be exercising undue fascination upon the people of Japan. Iyeyasu, the first Tokugawa Shogun, caused Japan to be cut off from the rest of the world; this entailed also controlling thought, and this control of thought led to sterility of ideas. During these three centuries of enforced isolation Buddhism lost nearly all its vitality, although certain of the sects are considered to have learnt something from contact with the Christian missionaries.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century a revival of interest in Shinto took place; this revival was to play a significant part in the "restoration" of the Emperor to his pristine glory in 1868. Revived interest in Shinto showed up the obscurity of the position of the Emperor at the time. When Japan found herself menaced by the West, not only was the feudal or military regime (the Bakufu or Shogunate), which under different dynasties of "Shoguns" had usurped the

power of the Emperor for the past nine hundred years, overthrown, but at the same time the Emperor was restored to the position he had once occupied in the dim past. Buddhism was considered to be mixed up with the regime that had been cast off; everything was done to return to the state of affairs that had existed in Japan before Buddhism arrived. Buddhism was therefore proscribed, many of its temples desecrated and its influence eliminated.

This did not, however, last, and Buddhism later regained much of its prestige and part of its property. Nevertheless Shinto won, and it was to the primitive views of the Japanese before they came into contact with Chinese civilization that the statesmen at the end of the nineteenth century turned for a religion. They saw that the worship of the Emperor and of the State—"The Way of the Emperor"—would form the cement for the cohesion which was needed, if Japan were to survive the dangers of contact with the outer world. They perhaps did not realize that it is difficult for a god to rule, since all his actions must be perfect; in practice he must delegate authority to others. The military are, therefore, now in an equivalent position to that held by successive dynasties of "Shoguns" throughout the centuries.

With the return to primitive Tribalism or State Idolatry came the problem how to regiment the other conflicting "religions"; this was only solved by the recognition of the four religions in 1940. Of these four Buddhism was already devitalized and long used to regimentation and, therefore, presented little difficulty. "Sectarian Shinto" is itself a growth from "State Shinto"; it consists of a variety of sects occupying themselves with special cults of different Shinto divinities. Some of these sects attempt to form a patriotic synthesis of all religions with Shinto. The recognition of Islam was purely for political purposes; It is obvious that Islam must be utterly opposed to

any form of State Idolatry or Emperor Worship, and it is therefore impossible for a Japanese to be a sincere Muslim. Christianity presents similar difficulties. Iyeyasu, in the seventeenth century, saw that Christianity, by stressing loyalty to a supra-national God, might undermine the foundations of his State, based upon feudal principles of loyalty to immediate superiors only; he therefore exterminated it. For similar reasons Christianity is viewed with anxiety by the protagonists of "State Shinto" today. First the Protestant sects have been made into a National Church on the German model, that they may be the better controlled. It is interesting to note that the foundation of this church was announced by a special messenger to the Sun Goddess at her shrine at Ise.

The State Idolatries of Germany and Japan, therefore, are close parallels. As Hitler tolerates any religion which will toe the line, and allow the worship of the German race (and indeed of Hitler himself) first place, so the rulers of Japan tolerate the four religions they have recognized, while retaining to themselves those universal and absolute qualities associated with true religion. The Japanese have, however, been decidedly cleverer than Hitler in their methods—or perhaps they have applied them in a more cynical manner, unhampered by latent memories of past morality! By stating the lie that State Shinto is not a religion, they caused considerable dissension among adherents of other religions; this legal fiction made it possible for them to declare that bowing at Shinto shrines is not a religious act.

The Japanese have a noted facility for holding directly opposed ideas without apparently realizing the contradiction between them; thus even the genuinely pious among them can easily swallow the distinction between Shinto and religion forced upon them. However, Government apologists and the more lyrical among the nationalists let the cat out of the bag; their

declarations (which are becoming more frequent and less guarded) openly call Shinto "the Perfect Religion," "the Religion of Religious," while the slogan "Hakko Ichiu" (or "Eight Corners under One Roof"—i.e. all the world under the rule of the Japanese Emperor) supposes that all are to be forced to enjoy the benefits of Shinto.

This worship of the tribe is directly opposed to any form of international order; it means that to the Japanese other peoples and other races are beyond the pale. To the Japanese, God is a Japanese. This crassly materialistic and impossibly narrow conception bars the Japanese from successful intercourse with their fellow men. It means, among other things, that they have no sense of universal right and wrong, of universal justice; right and wrong are only for the Japanese. If they apply to others at all, they are applied to them only as an instrument of policy to the greater glory of the Japanese race.

It is to be feared that it is in this spirit that the Japanese on their side have entered into relations with the Vatican; let us hope, however, that the Vatican's conception of this relationship will be able to influence for the good the champions of State Idolatry! Japanese newspapers, in their leading articles praising the sending of a Minister to the Vatican, have already begun to stress that the popular mind must realize that in the Co-prosperity Sphere any religion must be in sympathy with the idea of the Way of the Emperor, and that Christian ideas must go parallel with the idea of the Way of the Emperor. We foresee the possibility of considerable embarrassment!

* * *

Thoughts, however foul, do not stain the soul if they do not please and if they are not received by the will with consent. Many saints at times have felt vehement motions of vices in their lower nature, but they contradicted and opposed them by their reason and will.

—LUDOVICUS BLOSIUS.

Religion and Reform

REV. P. MCKEVITT

Reprinted from HIBERNIA (Dublin)

THE last century was remarkable for the prevalence of two convictions. There was a widespread belief among the learned that the day of Revealed Religion was over. Any explanation of the course of the world that it might offer was put on a par with the myths by which our romantic ancestors explained to themselves the mysteries of the world. Religion was dying because there was little left for it to explain, since science was ready with a more reasonable answer to the riddle of the universe.

The capacity for faith of these credulous scientists was remarkable. They were as credulous about their pretensions as were the more primitive races whose beliefs and practices they scrutinized. But the iconoclasts were not satisfied with breaking up images; they knew that they must find some substitute for religion. For destroyers must find a substitute, and we know by experience that counterfeits are usually less durable than the originals.

The unfortunate result of this presumptuous attitude towards religion, is that our difficulty today is in harmonizing religious and secular activities. The architects of the new order wished to leave man free to build his own world. When that world crashed, it was not so easy to restore a religious way of life. Man cannot be made religious by Parliamentary Decree. Nor can religion be recalled from banishment to stave off a crisis. It is an influence which forms the will and outlook of its adherents. And it must continue to exercise this influence all the days of a man's life. It will not tolerate compromise or toleration; it must be dominant.

RELIGION MUST BE ACTIVE

Genuine social reform must come from religion. It will not come by way of a program to which men promise allegiance. It must be the work of the whole man, of the man who is conscientious and God-fearing. In this world it is for us to strive and endure and so fulfil the will of God. Labor and toil are sanctified through their acceptance as a duty. They become acts of adoration.

In the Catholic outlook on life, there is no sharp cleavage between work and prayer. Work is prayer. It is the fulfilment of one's destiny. Judgment will be meted out in accordance with our conscientious discharge or neglect of it. When religion lapses into meaning the performance of certain exercises and ceases to shape and direct the whole of man's activities, then it ceases to be a living force and becomes a dead institution.

Even in Catholic countries, the tension between life for God and life in the world is felt. Perhaps the tension is more acute in such countries. To some extent this is inevitable, as the Christian soul is in a state of exile. But the tension is particularly sharp today, because the world in which we work has been shaped by men who denied God. That is one reason why some dismiss Catholic ideas of reform as unpractical. They fail to see that if the world as we know it cannot assimilate these reforms, then the world must be changed.

Now that the world is in process of destruction—for there is small chance of emergence from the war without radical changes in our institutions—there may be a chance for genuine restoration. To object that needed reforms are unpractical would be a feeble excuse. It may appear idealistic to advocate a living wage for every worker. Industry may seem incapable of paying it. Yet we may be sure that if we cannot find

a way of accomplishing it, in the long or perhaps the short run, the sanctity of the prevailing economic order will be challenged.

The success of our reform depends on the creation of a new man who will work with a deep-rooted sense of his responsibility to God. Such a requirement may frighten us, but we should be shamed by the example of false reformers who made similar demands from their followers. Their disciples have responded by renunciation and self-sacrifice. Is it that we, fortified by supernatural resources as we are, cannot confront the world with the man who views his task as a test whereby he proves himself for eternity? Such a man will not rule as a king over men and materials; he will serve as a steward and give strict account of his enterprise. The fear of the Lord will be more potent with him than fear of the law. Evasion of the social obligations imposed upon him, whether he be master or servant, will be impossible when the obligations are from God. Pretended ignorance or apathy will not serve as pretext for doing nothing. The man who is conscious of his social obligations knows that he must search out ways to fulfil the Divine Decrees. An awakened conscience will dispel the indifference and smug self-satisfaction which are still the main obstacles to progress.

WE CATHOLICS ARE TOO TIMID

Can social reform be inspired by a non-religious source? It can, provided that the driving force transform itself into a religion. Whenever a break is made with a bad past, discontent gives the first stimulus to action and enthusiasm fans the first protests into a vigorous flame. This enthusiasm becomes disciplined and crystallizes into worship of a leader and unquestioned acceptance of some gospel of reform.

There is a religious force in a movement of the kind

that stimulates the instinct for self-sacrifice and devotedness burning—faintly perhaps—in every heart. The honor paid to the saints by Catholics finds its counterpart in the worship of leaders, and the official writings become a Bible. The tomb of Lenin in the Red Square of Moscow and the respect paid to his writings and to those of Marx show us how the need for religion finds satisfaction even among those who have, of deliberate purpose, set out to eradicate all religion. But if the religion be of human origin, it soon corrodes under the acid of cynicism and selfishness.

Even patriotism, if pagan, becomes corrupted when exposed to the temptations of wealth and power. The new orders and the new ways of reform can command a fanatic loyalty. They can effect wonderful changes in the beginning. But human self-seeking, ambition and lust for power must find a controlling force outside of and superior to man: otherwise they will burst the dams that the enthusiasm of early days has built, and they will wreck the city. To save himself from himself man needs God.

The work of reform, then, must effect a restoration of harmony between man and his duties. If religion enjoins just dealing, then there must be zeal for justice in the mind of the master and man. They are not to be just merely through compulsion of a human kind, but because God wills that men should hunger after justice. When religion preaches self-sacrifice, the Christian sees that renunciation is to be practised by him in the discipline of his work. Patience must be exercised in the toleration of those over us, under us, or who work with us. Every part of our work will be done differently because we are followers of Christ. It is not sufficient to quote the Gospels whenever they favor our case. We must live the Gospel, and train ourselves to endure the hard parts and accept the hard sayings.

Do not such truths as these point to the necessity of a special formation if we are to attain the height of our responsibilities as Catholics? If we complain that the Old Order was irreligious, we must meet the challenge to guide the world to a better path. We were too timid in the past, though the Papal warnings ought to have shocked us out of our complacency. We feared to disturb society unduly and we allowed others to take control. Now the city seems to be collapsing through its own instability and all around us are discussions concerning the architecture of the new building. Committees to plan post-war reconstruction have already been formed. Let us be clear about what we want and what we will not tolerate. The old compromises will not suffice. The world is in need of a more active Christianity, to guide discontent into the paths of reform. The day of the cynic and the dispirited is finished. Changes are rapidly coming. They may come by reason of our initiative or in spite of us. If they do not come through a renewal of the Christian spirit, so much the worse for the world.

Some Things New and Old

JACQUINOT DE BESANGE

Who is Jacquinot de Besange?

To give him his correct ascription he is the Rev. Jacquinot de Besange, S.J., the famous one-armed Jesuit priest who distinguished himself at Shanghai in 1927 in protecting the civilian population caught between the opposing Chinese armies.

This famous French Jesuit, whom even the invading Japanese respect, was last heard of as being at Hong Kong, where he is conducting relief work and doing his best for the civilian and military prisoners who are in the power of the Japanese invaders.

At Shanghai Father de Besange was instrumental in saving many thousands from starvation and death. Everyone in the Far East knows him, and because of the high regard in which he is held by the Japanese military leaders, he is no doubt the only white man able to relieve the misery of the captives in Hong Kong.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

Why has the Catholic Church condemned Christian Science?

The Church has not formally and officially condemned Christian Science, so-called. But the fact is that no Catholic can frequent the religious observances of the Christian Scientists and continue to be a Catholic in good standing. This is not a question of condemning the good intentions of Christian Science; rather it is a question of facing facts.

First of all, you cannot be a Christian unless you have been received into the Christian Church by Baptism, and since Baptism does not enter into the religious scheme of Christian Science, the adherents of that sect are hardly entitled to call themselves Christians. So much for the Christian side of these religionists.

As to Science, Christian Science teaches that matter is the principle of evil, that mind alone is real and that all material things are illusions. And that is not only unscientific, but it is nonsense as well. The material universe was created by God—you have to believe that if you believe in the Bible at all, which every Catholic must do. And, moreover, since you accept the Bible as the Word of God, inspired by the Holy Spirit, you must believe also that the material universe which God created was good. That is what the Bible says: "And God saw that it was good" (Genesis, chapter one).

So how can anyone be a Christian Scientist and repudiate the Christian Sacrament of Baptism, and in addition believe that matter, which God created and saw that it was good, is the principle of evil? Now the individual Christian Scientist may be a very good living and edifying person. But that is not the question at issue. The question is whether this sect is either Christian or scientific, and the answer is that it is neither, if Christian and Science are words that have a real meaning.

IRISH CATHOLIC PRESIDENTS

Have any of the Presidents of the United States been Catholics of Irish ancestry?

There has never been a Catholic President of the United States whether of Irish ancestry or other, although there is no Constitutional reason why any such should not be President. Eight of our Presidents were of Irish ancestry, but all of them were Protestants. Their names are:

Andrew Jackson, 1829, Presbyterian; James Knox Polk, 1845, Methodist; James Buchanan, 1857, Presbyterian; Andrew Johnson, 1865, Methodist; Ulysses Simpson Grant, 1869, Methodist; Chester Alan Arthur, 1881, Episcopalian; William McKinley, 1897, Methodist; Woodrow Wilson, 1913, Presbyterian. The parents of Presidents Jackson and Buchanan were immigrants from Ireland.

But if none of these Presidents of Irish descent were themselves Catholics, it is interesting to know that, with the exception of Presidents Buchanan and Arthur, they all had either Catholic relatives or descendants — Andrew Jackson, 16; James K. Polk, 21; Ulysses S. Grant, 25; Woodrow Wilson, 19. Seven of the Catholic connections of President Woodrow Wilson were on the side of his second wife.